what it does not disclose. In conjunction with the fact described previously that DeMoney's device operates at entirely different level, it is clear that DeMoney's invention does not preclude my own in any sense, just like my invention does not preclude, but also does not include DeMoney's.

## Conclusion

During the examination process I have answered all questions and identified and proven important distinctions between prior art identified in any/all office actions so far and in general. I previously provided proofs as to why my claims are not subject to restriction/election as they truly are inseparable. Prior art and even patents being issued presently, as well as examiner's own extrapolations clearly show that improvements my invention brings are not at all obvious even to experts.

After two years of examination, all claim amendments and considering all proofs I have provided before, it is clear that all rejections, objections and restriction and/or election requirements are favorably answered (for all claims 1 through 19 without exceptions as requirement for restriction and/or election is proven improper). No technical or other proper proof to the contrary was identified. Therefore, I submit that this application should not have ever been subject to restriction and/or election requirement and that it is now in full condition for allowance, which I respectfully solicit.

Yours very respectfully,

Aleksandar Susnjar
25 Saintsbury Road
Markham, Ontario L6C 2H9
CANADA
Tel/Fax. (905) 284-7853
Cell. (416) 721-7853